

**From:** [Caudill, Motria](#)  
**To:** [Keating, James W.](#)  
**Subject:** Preliminary method comparison for our Sept-October '14 field project  
**Date:** Wednesday, June 03, 2015 3:18:00 PM

---

Hi Jim – Long time no see! I hope all is well with you and your lovely fenceline air monitoring system.

It took quite a while to get all of our laboratory results, but the day has come. I am summarizing our findings and wanted to give you a heads up about a possible issue with the auto-GC data.

I averaged BP's hourly data as it corresponded to our eight weeklong canister/tube deployments. The toluene data agree pretty well across all three methods. The benzene data for Sites 2 & 3 look okay, too. But at Sites 1 & 4, you might want to take a look at the calculations in the data processing: your benzene concentrations week-to-week are correlated with our results (cans and tubes analyzed by two different labs), but your values are much higher. Would it be possible for you to check whether there is any difference in how the data are handled/calculated at the four stations?

I was hoping to present a comparison of all three methods at the National Environmental Monitoring Conference (NEMC), which is July 13-17; see link below. I can focus on the EPA methods only if it takes longer to sort things out. Let me know what you think.

<http://www.nemc.us/>

Thanks!

~~~~~  
Motria P. Caudill, Ph.D.  
Air Monitoring & Analysis Section  
USEPA Region 5 (AT-18J)  
77 W. Jackson Blvd.  
Chicago, IL 60604  
telephone (312) 886-0267  
direct fax (312) 582-5863  
~~~~~